

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 26, 2004 with claims 1 through 20. Claims 1 through 20 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are proposed to be amended herein.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Arnett et al. (United States Patent No. 6,078,661), rejected claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanderson et al. (United States Patent No. 4,493,951) in view of Arnett et al., and rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacca (United States Patent No. 6,876,742) in view of Hershbarger et al.  
10 (United States Patent No. 5,654,984).

### Independent Claims 1, 8 and 14

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Arnett et al., independent claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanderson et al. in view of Arnett et al., and claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacca in view of Hershbarger et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Arnett discloses one or more solder pads (FIG. 2: element 45, i.e. terminals are connected via a trace on the board 22 to the ground pad area 45 for connecting said modem module to said carrier assembly). Regarding claim 14, the Examiner asserts that Sacca discloses one or more solder pads (FIG. 1: element 104) for connecting said modem circuitry (FIG. 1: element 106) to a carrier assembly.

Applicants note that the conventional method for attaching a modem to a motherboard is by integrating the modem circuitry into the motherboard, *thereby requiring that a certified motherboard be recertified following the integration*. (See, page 1, lines 13-27, of the originally filed specification.) In one aspect of the present invention, a modem module is provided that may be attached to a motherboard and thereby eliminates the need to recertify the motherboard. Applicants also note that, regarding ground pad area 45, Arnett teaches that “the circuit board 22 includes a *ground pad area 45 which is provides a contact with the ground terminal 32, and a set of protection circuitry 48.*” (Col. 6, lines 19-22; emphasis added.) In addition, Applicants note that the Examiner does not allege that Sacca discloses solder pads; in fact, Sacca makes no mention of the term “solder pads.” Moreover, Arnett et al., Sanderson et al., Sacca, and Hershbarger et al., alone or in combination, do *not* disclose or suggest one or

more solder pads for *connecting a signal line of a modem module to a carrier assembly*. Independent claims 1, 8, and 14, as amended, require one or more solder pads for connecting a *signal line of said modem module* to said carrier assembly. Support for this amendment can be found on page 4, lines 3-9, of the originally filed disclosure.

5           Thus, Arnett et al., Sanderson et al., Sacca, and Hershbarger et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more solder pads for connecting a signal line of said modem module to said carrier assembly, as required by independent claims 1, 8, and 14, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-13 and 15-20

10          Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-20 are dependent on claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Arnett et al., Sanderson et al., Sacca, and Hershbarger et al., or in combination, because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 8, and 14 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

15          Conclusion

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 1-20, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

20          If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

25          Date: November 11, 2008

30